

REMARKS

Claims 19 to 27 are in this case.

The various objection and rejection to claims 1 to 18 have been overcome by cancelling the claims and substituting new claims.

With respect to the rejection for double patenting, all of the cases cited by the Examiner were prior to the 1995 changes in the patent laws. This case has the same effective filing date as does Applicant's patent. In this situation, under current law, in order for there to be double patenting the claims of this case must be substantially identical a claim of the patent which is not the case.

Claim 19 is patentable since it recites, "computer means for monitoring both said machines and said procedures, and producing information as to the operations of such machines and procedures" in combination with the remainder of the claim.

Claim 20 is patentable since it recites, "computer means provides said station with an output which sets forth prices computed from the operations of more than one of said machines" in combination with the remainder of the claim.

Claim 21 is patentable since it recites, "computer means provides said station with information on procedures performed on each of said machines as well as summaries of the operations of all of said machines" in combination with the remainder of the claim.

Claim 22 is patentable since it recites, "computer means compares an actual operation of each machine with a standard procedure and determines any difference or similarity between said standard procedure and said actual operation" in combination with the remainder of the claim.

Claim 23 is patentable since it recites, "computer means for monitoring both said machines and said operators, and producing information as to the operations of

such machines and operators" in combination with the remainder of the claims.

Claim 24 is patentable since it recites, "computer means compares an actual operation of each machine with a standard procedure and determines any difference or similarity between said standard procedure and said actual operation" in combination with the remainder of the claim.

Claim 25 is patentable since it recites, "providing a number of individual medical imaging machines each of which will producing images of some type of a part of a living body" in combination with the remainder of the claim.

Claim 26 is patentable since it recites, "computer means compares an actual operation of each machine with a standard procedure and determines any difference or similarity between said standard procedure and said actual operation" in combination with the remainder of the claim.

Claim 27 is patentable since it recites, "said step of providing computer means provides separate computers for each medical imaging machine and for the supervisor" in combination with the remainder of the claim.

Respectfully,



William D. Hall
Attorney for Applicant
Register 14, 311

Address: 10850 Stanmore Dr.
Potomac, MD 20854
Phone: 301-983-5070
Fax: 301-765-0112